



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/506,711	09/07/2004	Gildo Di Domenico	PF020012	4898

7590 03/24/2008
Joseph S Tripoli
Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing Inc
P O Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

EXAMINER

RAABE, CHRISTOPHER M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2879

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

03/24/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/506,711	Applicant(s) DI DOMENICO ET AL.	
	Examiner CHRISTOPHER M. RAABE	Art Unit 2879	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 January 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-5,7 and 8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-5,7 and 8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on January 8, 2007 has been entered.

2. Applicant's arguments filed January 8, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 2879

4. Claims 1,3-5,7,8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dossot et al. (USPN 5592045).

With regard to claim 1,

Dossot et al. disclose in at least column 1, lines 5-10 and figure 4 an electron beam deflection system for a cathode-ray tube comprising a pair of horizontal deflection coils (not pictured) and a pair of vertical deflection coils (not pictured), these two pairs being electrically insulated from each other by a separator (70), and at least one pair of auxiliary coils (20,21) placed around the neck of the tube (not pictured), intended to modify the magnetic field created by at least one of the two pairs of deflection coils, the said pair of auxiliary coils (20,21) being placed on a cylindrical support (27), wherein the part of the said support (27) on which the pair of auxiliary coils (20,21) is placed comprises regions (22,23,24,25) with a low relative permittivity.

While Dossot et al. do not disclose the auxiliary coils to be formed on a flexible sheet that is then wound around a rigid plastic support, this practice was well known to and widely used by those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow the coils to be printed on a flat surface prior to being flexed to conform to a desired three-dimensional shape, determined by the rigid plastic support, allowing for easier production.

With regard to claim 3,

Dossot et al. disclose additionally in column 2, lines 55-60 an electron beam deflection system, wherein the support (27) for the auxiliary coils (20,21) is independent of the separator (70).

Art Unit: 2879

With regard to claim 4,

Dossot et al. disclose the electron beam deflection system.

Dossot et al. do not disclose the material used to form the support for the auxiliary coils. However, Dossot et al. do disclose the separator to be made of plastic (column 1, lines 5-10), the support to be made of a flexible material, and the auxiliary coils to be engraved onto the support using printed circuit board fabrication techniques (column 2, lines 20-25). Plastic was a material well-known to and widely used by those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention as a flexible material used in printed circuit board fabrication techniques, and would therefore have been obvious to the same to incorporate into the deflection system of Dossot et al.

With regard to claim 5,

Dossot et al. disclose an electron beam deflection system, wherein the regions (22,23,24,25) with a low relative permittivity are produced by decreasing the thickness of the support (27).

With regard to claim 7,

Dossot et al. disclose the electron beam deflection system according to claim 1, wherein the regions of low relative permittivity (22,23,24,25) are produced by creating windows.

With regard to claim 8,

Dossot et al. disclose in at least column 2, lines 10-15 and cited portions in the rejection of claim 1, a cathode-ray tube whose electron beam deflection system complies with claim 1.

Response to Arguments

5. In response to applicant's argument that Dossot et al. disclose the holes (22,23,24,25) as being used for placement of the auxiliary coils and do not disclose the holes providing areas of lower permittivity, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In this case, the holes (22,23,24,25) do provide areas of lower permittivity.

Additionally, while the applicant argues that Dossot et al do not disclose horizontal and vertical deflection coils, the examiner asserts that these features are disclosed in figure 1 and column 1, lines 1-15.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHRISTOPHER M. RAABE whose telephone number is (571)272-8434. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f 7am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimesh Patel can be reached on 571-272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2879

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

CR

/Sikha Roy/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2879